

**Remarks/Arguments:**

Claims 1-10 are pending in the above identified application.

Claims 1, 3-4, 6, 8 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Zhou. This ground for rejection is overcome by the amendments to claims 1, 4, 6, 8 and 10. In particular, Zhou does not disclose or suggest decoding and storing all I-frames and P-frames from a first group of pictures (GOP), exclusive of I and P frames from any other GOP, upon initiation of a reverse play command. Basis for these amendments may be found in the specification at paragraphs [0006] and [0029] and Figure 2B.

The Zhou application requires that the I and P frames from the current group of pictures and the I frame from the next group of pictures be decoded before the display of the current group of pictures. (See Zhou col. 6, line 62 through col. 7, line 12). The I frame from the next group of pictures is referred to as a transitive frame. Zhou discloses that decoding the transitive frame is one of the most important features in the disclosed invention. (See col. 7, lines 7-11). The present invention, as defined by claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 8 and 10 requires that the I frame from the next group of pictures not be decoded before the display of the current group of pictures. Because Zhou is inconsistent with this limitation of claims 1, 4, 6, 8 and 10, claims 1, 4, 6, 8 and 10 are not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) in view of Zhou. Furthermore, because Zhou indicates that this feature is "one of the important features in the disclosed system," it would not be obvious to eliminate this feature from Zhou.

Claim 3 includes all the features of claim 1 from which it depends. Therefore, claim 3 is also not subject to rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) in view of Zhou.

Applicants appreciate the indication in the Office Action that claims 2, 5, 7 and 9 would be allowable if amended to be independent and to include all of the limitations of their base claims and any intervening claims. Because, as described above, claims 1, 4, 6 and 8 are in condition for allowance, no amendment to claims 2, 5, 7 and 9 is needed.

The prior art made of record but not applied has been considered but does not affect the patentability of the invention.

Appl. No.: 10/011,545  
Amendment Dated October 18, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of July 19, 2004

MAPT-606US

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the objections to claims 2, 5, 7 and 9 and the rejection of claims 1, 4, 6, 8 and 10.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Kenneth N. Nigon, Reg. No. 31,549  
Attorney for Applicant


KNN/ks

Dated: October 18, 2004

P.O. Box 980  
Valley Forge, PA 19482  
(610) 407-0700

The Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge payment to Deposit Account No. 18-0350 of any fees associated with this communication.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, with sufficient postage, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on: October 18, 2004



K\_I:\MATP\606US\AMEND.DOC